REMARKS

The last Office Action of March 15, 2005 has been carefully considered. Reconsideration of the instant application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-13 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 7, and 13 have been amended. New claims 14-19 have been added. No claims have been canceled. No amendment to the specification has been made. No fee is due.

Claims 1-13 stand rejected under 37 C.F.R. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. 4,262,336 to Pritchard. Record is made of a telephonic interview with the Examiner on April 11, 2005, during which the Examiner confirmed that the reference to U.S. Pat. No. 4,449,196 in the Detailed Section of the Office Action has been made in error and should have read --4,262,336-- to correspond to the citation in Form PTO 892.

This rejection is traversed in view of amendments to the independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and the remarks set forth below.

Referring first to amended claim 7, a method is described for numerical control of machine tools, robots or production machines, with the steps of generating marker signals, in particular desired position values, for system components, in particular drives, according to an interpolation clock cycle, providing by way of a control axis reference values for reading a table according to the interpolation clock cycle, defining in the table encoded and/or non-encoded desired position values for synchronous successor axes, and/or extracting,

independent from the interpolation clock cycle, encoded and/or non-encoded functions stored in the table, and triggering execution of these functions several times by the synchronous successor axes independent of the interpolation clock cycle.

Pritchard describes a multiaxis control system with a main computer 1 and secondary computers 10 and 11 which receive interpolation or secondary computer programs from the main computer 1 via I/O bus 8. The secondary computers provide motor control or command signals to motor controls or drivers (col. 6, lines 35-46). A second computer controller 20 communicates with main computer 1 via I/O bus 8 and provides synchronizing and common timing to secondary computers 10 and 11 (col. 6, lines 52-55). The main computer selects one of a plurality of timing signal sources in the secondary computer controller 20 which determines the rate of iteration in the secondary computers. The length of the sequence or the number of iterations performed by the secondary computer is controlled ... as predetermined by the main computer (col. 6, line 66, to col. 7, line 5).

Although Pritchard describes the secondary computer memory as having iteration data stored in a RAM, there is no teaching or suggestion in Pritchard of "triggering execution of these functions several times by the synchronous successor axes independent of the interpolation clock cycle, as recited in amended claim 7.

Independent claims 1 and 13 recite likewise that the function is executed or the execution is triggered several times by the synchronous successor axes

independent of the interpolation clock cycle.

As described with particularity in Para. **[0012]** of the specification:

> *The program code is reduced by storing functions in tables, because the functions stored in the table can be accessed multiple times during a program execution. With encoding, a table structure that is already stored in a program can be used so that the encoded functions fit an existing table structure.* It is also stated that *the successor axis is not moved by a conventional command "LEADON" synchronously with the control axes* (i.e., the interpolation clock cycle).

For the reasons set forth above, it is applicant's contention that Pritchard neither teaches nor suggests the features of the present invention, as recited in claims 1, 7, and 13.

As for the rejection of the dependent claims2-6, and 8-12, these claims depend on claims 1 and 7, respectively, share their presumably allowable features, and therefore it is respectfully submitted that these claims should also be allowed.

Applicant has added new claims 14-19 which are made dependent on claims 1 and 7, respectively, to encompass the full scope and breadth of the invention Support for the new claims 14-19 can be found in Para. **[0012]** of the specification.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and allowance of claim 1-19 are thus respectfully requested.

Applicant has also carefully scrutinized the further cited prior art and finds it without any relevance to the newly submitted claims. It is thus felt that no specific discussion thereof is necessary.

In view of the above presented remarks and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that all claims on file should be considered patentably differentiated over the art and should be allowed.

Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner consider necessary or desirable any formal changes anywhere in the specification, claims and/or drawing, then it is respectfully requested that such changes be made by Examiner's Amendment, if the Examiner feels this would facilitate passage of the case to issuance. If the Examiner feels that it might be helpful in advancing this case by calling the undersigned, applicant would greatly appreciate such a telephone interview.

Respectfully submitted,

By: _____
Henry M. Feiereisen
Agent For Applicant
Reg. No: 31,084

Date: July 12, 2005
350 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4714
New York, N.Y. 10118
(212)244-5500
HMF:WS:af